

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed from the United States Patent and Trademark Office on November 29, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 and 9-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Harshberger et al (United States Patent No. 5,311,397, hereinafter “Harshberger”), and rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harshberger in view of Dickie (United States Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0268005A1, hereinafter “Dickie”). Applicant respectfully provides the following:

35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-7 and 9-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,311,397 to Harshberger. Applicant respectfully submits that the claim set as provided herein is not anticipated by the cited reference. The standard for a Section 102 rejection is set forth in M.P.E.P 706.02, which provides:

“... for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present.”

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference does not teach every aspect of the amended claim set as provided herein and therefore does not anticipate the claim set provided herein. For example, independent claim 1 recites a robust customizable computing system comprising: a processing control unit having a non-peripheral based encasement and an electrical printed circuit board configuration that comprises multiple interconnected boards, wherein one of said interconnected boards is directly and transversely coupled to another of said interconnected boards; an external object; and means for operably connecting said processing control unit to said external object, said processing control unit introducing intelligence into said external object and causing said external object to perform smart functions. Such limitations are supported by

the disclosure as originally filed. For example, reference is made to Figure 8 and the corresponding disclosure of the application as originally filed.

In contrast, Harshberger does not explicitly nor impliedly teach “an electrical printed circuit board configuration that comprises multiple interconnected boards, wherein one of said interconnected boards is directly and transversely coupled to another of said interconnected boards” as claimed in independent claim 1. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Harshberger does not anticipate independent claim 1 as provided herein. And since Harshberger does not anticipate independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Harshberger does not anticipate the corresponding dependent claims 2-14.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 15 and 16 also recite the limitation of “an electrical printed circuit board configuration that comprises multiple interconnected boards, wherein one of said interconnected boards is directly and transversely coupled to another of said interconnected boards.” And, for at least the reason that Harshberger does not explicitly nor impliedly teach “an electrical printed circuit board configuration that comprises multiple interconnected boards, wherein one of said interconnected boards is directly and transversely coupled to another of said interconnected boards” as claimed in independent claims 15 and 16, Applicant respectfully submits that Harshberger does not anticipate independent claims 15 or 16. And, since Harshberger does not anticipate independent claim 16, Applicant respectfully submits that Harshberger does not anticipate the corresponding dependent claims 17-19.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the reasons provided herein, the claim set as provided herein is not anticipated by the reference cited in the Office Action.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harshberger in view of Dickie. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as provided herein are not made obvious by the cited references.

M.P.E.P. 706.02(j) sets forth the standard for a Section 103(a) rejection:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not teach or suggest, alone or in combination, all of the limitations claimed in the present claim set. For example, independent claim 1 recites a robust customizable computing system comprising: a processing control unit having a non-peripheral based encasement and an electrical printed circuit board configuration that comprises multiple interconnected boards, wherein one of said interconnected boards is directly and transversely coupled to another of said interconnected boards; an external object; and means for operably connecting said processing control unit to said external object, said processing control unit introducing intelligence into said external object and causing said external object to perform smart functions. Such limitations are supported by the disclosure as originally filed. For example, reference is made to Figure 8 and the corresponding disclosure of the application as originally filed.

In contrast, the references cited in the Office Action do not teach or suggest, alone or in combination, all of the claimed limitations. For example, the references cited in the Office

Action do not teach or suggest, alone or in combination, “an electrical printed circuit board configuration that comprises multiple interconnected boards, wherein one of said interconnected boards is directly and transversely coupled to another of said interconnected boards” as claimed in independent claim 1. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that the references cited in the Office Action do not make obvious independent claim 1 as provided herein. And, the cited references do not make obvious independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not make obvious the corresponding dependent claims 2-14.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 15 and 16 also recite the limitation of “an electrical printed circuit board configuration that comprises multiple interconnected boards, wherein one of said interconnected boards is directly and transversely coupled to another of said interconnected boards.” And, for at least the reason that the cited references do not teach or suggest, alone or in combination, “an electrical printed circuit board configuration that comprises multiple interconnected boards, wherein one of said interconnected boards is directly and transversely coupled to another of said interconnected boards” as claimed in independent claims 15 and 16, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not make obvious independent claims 15 or 16. And, since the cited references do not make obvious independent claim 16, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not make obvious the corresponding dependent claims 17-19.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the reasons provided herein, the claim set as provided herein overcomes all rejections made by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that the amendments made herein do not add new matter and that the claims are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request favorable reconsideration. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this communication, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

DATED this 28th day of February, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



Berne S. Broadbent
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 30,550

KIRTON & McCONKIE
1800 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: (801) 328-3600
Facsimile: (801) 321-4893

BSB/DBT/hlw
868030.1